

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-35 and 37-41 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

**Restriction**

Applicant incorporates herein the arguments presented in the response of August 20, 2010, and Applicant reasserts that the restriction is improper because no serious burden can be established. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner either withdraw the restriction or make the restriction final so that Applicant may petition for relief.

Alternatively and additionally, in view of the arguments presented below, Applicant believes that Claims 1-35 and 37-41 are in condition for allowance and seek to reintroduce Claims 1-22 pursuant to MPEP §821.04.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 38 stands as objected. Insofar as they may be applied to the claims, this objection is respectfully traversed.

This objection is improper because Claim 38 should have been rejected. “The refusal to grant claims because the subject matter as claimed is considered unpatentable is called a ‘rejection[,]’” whereas an objections relate to “the form of the claim.” MPEP §706.01. Here, at page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Applicant’s use of the term “jumbo packet” renders Claim 38 indefinite. Indefiniteness is governed by 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and relates to patentability. *See, e.g.,* MPEP §2171.

Therefore, the Examiner should withdraw the objection to Claim 38 and reject Claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, if the Examiner believes it to be necessary.

Assuming, however, that Claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the term “jumbo packet” does not render Claim 38 indefinite. “Definiteness of claim language must be analyzed, not in a vacuum”; instead, the claim language must be viewed “in light of [t]he content of the particular application disclosure; [t]he teachings of the prior art; and [t]he claim interpretation that would be given by one possessing the ordinary level of skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made.” MPEP §2173.01. At paragraph [009] of the Application, as originally filed, Applicant states that “jumbo packets” are defined “according to 10GBASE-W.” 10GBASE-W is a well-known communication standard, making it clearly that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the meaning of “jumbo packet.” Therefore, Claim 38 is definite.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to Claim 38.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,901,100 by Taylor (“Taylor”), U.S. Patent No. 5,717,870 by Dobson (“Dobson”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,282,203 by Yeom et al. (“Yeom”) and Claims 28-35 and 37-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No 6,262,880 by Hanna et al. (“Hanna”), Taylor, and Dobson. Insofar as they may be applied to the claims, these rejections have been overcome.

Taylor, Dobson, Hanna, and Yeom (singularly or in any reasonable combination) do not disclose each an every feature of any of Claims 23-35 and 37-41. Specifically, Claims 23 and 28 have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the prior art and now specify the single-port memory array and the width conversion of data words carried out in the read and write buffers. As described in the Application, the conversion of a single-word-width internal input and output to and from double-word-width internal input and output enables implementation of FIFO memory using single port memory cells in the array. Additionally, the double-word-width domain resolves conflicts between asynchronous reads and writes to the array by assigning either a read cycle or a write cycle to each clock cycle and by including a two-stage, two-word-wide buffer, at both of the read and write interfaces. Because the references of record (in any reasonable combination) do not disclose these features, the references of record cannot render either of Claims 23 or 28 obvious.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of Claim 23-35 and 37-41 be withdrawn and that Claims 23-35 and 37-41 be allowed.

**Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-35 and 37-41.

In the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

DOCKET NO.  
TI-35745

PATENT APPLICATION  
SERIAL NO. 10/601,816

Should the Examiner require any further clarification to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John J. Patti/

Dated: January 21, 2011

John J. Patti  
Reg. No. 57,191  
Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999  
Dallas, Texas 75265  
Phone: (972)917-4144